

the Massachusetts Medical Society to discuss the effects on the nervous system of injury during birth, Dr. F. C. Irving stated (*New England Journal of Medicine*, September 11th, 1930) that at the Boston Lying-in Hospital 73 of 182 autopsies (40 per cent.) revealed intracranial hæmorrhage as the cause of death.

Dr. Munro of Boston (quoted in the *Lancet*, January 5th, 1929) had examined 117 cases, of which 56 died of immediate effects. One of his conclusions is that "the most common late result of cerebral damage in the new-born is hydrocephalus associated with either epilepsy or idiocy." This is the opinion also of W. E. Dandy, Ford, and other authorities.

W. Sharpe and A. S. Maclaire (*Journal of Surgery, Gynaecology, and Obstetrics*, February 1924) stated that "intracranial hæmorrhage during birth is much more frequent than is commonly supposed," and, apart from post-mortem findings, they gave evidence of the incidence of such hæmorrhage in infants born alive. "No fewer than 13 of 100 babies born consecutively in a lying-in hospital were shown after birth to have blood-stained or bloody cerebro-spinal fluid."

P. Balard, Obstetric Physician of Bordeaux, wrote a book on *The Meningeal Hæmorrhage in the Newly Born*, and J. Eric Stacey (*British Medical Journal*, December 12th, 1931) also dealt with the question of such hæmorrhage.

L. Schoenholz has applied radiography to cases of intracranial hæmorrhage. So have F. M. B. Allen and H. J. McClure of Belfast.

William Sharpe (in the book already quoted) said: "The remote effects of brain injuries in babies and children (such as spasticity and mental impairment) are merely reminders of former intracranial damage, usually a supracortical hæmorrhage, and we should be most careful in our examinations and treatment to anticipate these frightful sequelæ." He also said: "Lumbar puncture is of great use in the diagnosis of subdural bleeding. Increase of intracranial tension is always present. It can be measured with the mercurial manometer during lumbar puncture, and by the use of the ophthalmoscope."

Dr. H. C. Cameron (*Lancet*, December 15th, 1923) has made a close study of the "Symptomatology of Intracranial Hæmorrhage in the New-born," and in some cases was able to verify his observations post mortem.

Dr. Eardley Holland (*British Medical Journal*, 1923), in his investigations into the causes of death during delivery, observed that in 50 per cent. of the cases death was due to intracranial hæmorrhage; and that, *in the majority of cases, the forceps had been used*. Moreover, of the children who were not killed, some suffered from such incapacities as epilepsy, idiocy, imbecility, or paralysis due to cortical injury.

It seems rather strange in the face of such overwhelming evidence that Professor Berry

should ask the additional question: "If it was not hæmorrhage, what was it? If we are told it was just pressure, how comes it that the pressure of forceps—not of long duration anyway—produces feeble-mindedness in English children, whilst the much longer sustained pressure essential to the production of artificial head deformity, as habitually practised by many primitive peoples of to-day, produces no such effects?"

The answer is very simple. In the case of forceps violence is used, which, if the hæmorrhage is not attended to, will cause destruction of the neurons around the seat of injury. In the other case uniform pressure is applied to the skull (generally the frontal bone) for a lengthy period, causing a deformity of the head and brain, but no damage to the brain-cells.

Lastly, Professor Berry asks "how it is that only some institutions can elicit such evidence, whilst others find none?"

The answer is, because there are many superintendents of institutions for the care of feeble-minded, to whom the problem has never occurred, or, if they were acquainted with it, they had dismissed the evidence for similar inadequate reasons as Professor Berry has given.

To prove that I am an unreliable witness and critic, Professor Berry, in conclusion, again denies my statement that there is any conflict between Elliot Smith's and Brodman's sections of the cortex of structurally differentiated areas, on the one hand, and the *more recent* studies on the lamination of the cortex, on the other. Surely Professor Berry is mistaken, for Brodman published his histological investigations (which were followed later by Elliot Smith) in 1909, whereas the differentiation of brain cells in layers originated with Carl Wernicke some thirty years earlier.

According to the school of which Professor Berry is one of the representatives, "the infragranular layer is held to be the seat of the representation—the physical basis—of the animal instincts, reproduction, self-preservation, etc.; whilst the supragranular layer is concerned with will, intellect, control, etc." By a coincidence, while writing this letter, I had opened the latest number of the *British Medical Journal* (April 30th, 1932) and found therein a denial of this theory in the following statement: "The correlation between the infragranular, granular, and supragranular layers on the one hand, and the animal instincts, sensory perceptions, and the intellect, on the other, *cannot be accepted as an established fact*." Yet Professor Berry will not admit that there is a conflict of opinion.

BERNARD HOLLANDER.

57, Wimpole Street, W.1.

### To the Editor, *Eugenics Review*

SIR,—For Dr. Hollander's industry in collecting citations to suit his purpose, I am, as I

stated in my original review, lost in admiration. For his critical powers of evaluating evidence I am still as critical as before. However, in dismissing Dr. Hollander and his theories, I may quote paragraph 41 of the British Medical Association's Special Committee's Report on Mental Deficiency just published. That Committee, after as careful an investigation of the evidence as even Dr. Hollander could require, says:

"It may be accepted that birth injury is a cause of mental deficiency in a certain number of cases, and that it is an inferential cause in a somewhat larger number, but any claim that birth injury is the *cause* of the defect should be examined with critical care," and that, after all, is all I have asked Dr. Hollander to do.

RICHARD J. A. BERRY.

Bristol.

## "Preventive Medicine"

### *To the Editor, Eugenics Review*

SIR,—In the article, "Preventive Medicine," in your January issue, Dr. C. P. Blacker refers to the "German Marriage Advice Bureaux." It may interest your readers to learn that the original scheme for the formation of such bureaux came from our own country.

In giving evidence before the Royal Commission on Divorce and Matrimonial Causes, 1909, the present writer urged that the question of marriage should not be left in the hands of priests and lawyers, but that medical men should also have a voice in the matter. It was further advanced as a principle of vital importance that every marriage should be considered from the standpoint of the production of sane and healthy offspring.

In my evidence before the Commission (see Vol. III of Report, p. 109) is the following passage: "I would suggest to parents and guardians the prudence of requiring a certificate of fitness of a candidate for marriage from the point of view of the spouse on the one hand and of prospective children on the other. . . . I would also suggest the organization of advisory marriage bureaux, where all persons contemplating matrimony could obtain *gratis* and full investigation of their family and personal history, and secure advice as to the advisability or otherwise of the proposed marriage."

A few years later a paragraph in a London newspaper described a German marriage bureau. After a passing note of exclamation *re* the Teutonic enterprise I dismissed the matter from my mind. But now, twenty years or so later, one may perhaps be pardoned for making a mild protest, lest the oversight should become hopelessly stereotyped.

DAVID WALSH, M.D.

London, W.14.

## Eugenics and Socialism

### *To the Editor, Eugenics Review*

SIR,—In the Society's Annual Report for 1931-2 it is stated, quite rightly, that those Labour Members of Parliament who opposed the granting of leave to introduce the Sterilization Bill on July 21st, 1931, "were doubtless influenced by the contention of Dr. H. Morgan, who opposed the Bill, that the measure involved anti-working-class legislation." Dr. Morgan did comment on the "audacity" of Major Church, "a Labour Member rising from these benches to advocate anti-working-class legislation," and made sundry hints at the class issue before finally denouncing the Bill as "pagan, anti-democratic, anti-Christian." But contrary to the impression which might be conveyed by the bare statement of the *Society's* Report, Dr. Morgan was not making the sort of unreasoned speech which is popular with most politicians of all parties at an election. He did, in fact, make several points unconnected with the class issue: these may be read in the Official Commons Report (5th Series, Vol. 255, 1249 ff.); here I am only concerned with his evidence for those statements which "doubtless influenced" many Labour Members, though not Sir Charles Trevelyan, Miss Ellen Wilkinson, Dr. Somerville Hastings, and others. This evidence is summarized in the following three sentences from Dr. Morgan's argument; "At the bottom, mental deficiency is an economic problem"; "Heredity, still an unknown and exaggerated bogey of humanity, has been foisted on the world as the main cause of mental deficiency"; "There is nothing wrong with the germ plasm itself." Dr. Morgan's contention is thus that the arguments for the influence of heredity are unsatisfactory.

This position seems to me untenable, but equally untenable seems the position of those eugenicists who, practically speaking, ignore environment; though those may profess pity for other human beings condemned to enjoy the amenities of London below bridges or the Rhondda or East Lancashire, they do not in their political capacity (for reasons which need not here be discussed) consider that it is at all possible to adopt a ruthless slum clearance policy.

The argument from the "Jardins Ungemach" is two-edged: that experiment does show the advantage of good heredity, but it also shows the advantage of good surroundings; would it have received so much enthusiastic applause if it had been conducted in a Strasbourg slum?

The heredity-environment controversy is a Hegelian triad; first, the strict opponents of heredity; secondly, the equally strict opponents of environment; thirdly, those who support a synthesis of the other two views. There is no more effective way of driving most working-class